

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois



Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge			George 1	M. Marovich	Sitting Judge if Oth than Assigned Jud		
CASE NUMBER			89 C	R 907 - 3	DAT		
CASE TITLE				United States of America vs. Alfreda Vaughn-Robinson			
MOTION: [In the following box nature of the motion]			[In the following bornature of the motion	x (a) indicate the party filin being presented.]	g the motion, e.g., plaint	iff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly th	
				Memorandum C	pinion and Order		
DO	CKET EN	TRY:					
(1)		Filed 1	motion of [use list	ing in "Motion" box a	bove.]		
(2)		Brief in support of motion due					
(3)		Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due					
(4)		Ruling/Hearing on set for at					
(5)		Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at					
(6)		Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at					
(7)		Trial[set for/re-set for] on at					
(8)					at .		
(9)		[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] □ FRCP4(m) □ General Rule 21 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FRCP41(a)(2).					
(10)	I	[Other	docket entry] E			der. The petition is denied.	
(11)		[For fu	rther detail see orde	er attached to the origi	nal minute order I		
	No notices		vised in open court.		minute of dol.]	Document 3.5	
	No notices required.					Number 1	
	Notices mailed by judge's staff.			1		SEP 0 1 2000	
	Notified counsel by telephone.					date docketed	
_	Docketing to mail notices. Mail AO 450 form.						
Copy to judge/magistrate judge.			te judge.	ENEDEC	ED-7 OR DOCKETING	docketing deputy initials	
					-		
WAH courtroor deputy's initials				UU AUG	31 PM 4: 08	date mailed notice	

Date/time received in central Clerk's Office

mailing deputy initials

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
Vs.	DOCKETED No. 89 CR 907 - >
ALFREDA VAUGHN-ROBINSON,	SEP 0 } 2000
Defendant.))

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On July 31, 1990, defendant withdrew her plea of not guilty before Judge Marovich and entered a plea of guilty to counts 1 and 43 of the indictment pursuant to a written plea agreement. As part of that agreement the government agreed that the Sentencing Guidelines did not apply, and Judge Marovich sentenced defendant to five years probation, with the first three months as work release.

Apparently, in April 1998, defendant filed a petition for a writ of error coram nobis, or at least intended to file such a petition. In any event, nothing happened and the government had no record of such a petition. On February 29 of this year defendant filed a "renewed" petition, and it was referred to me because Judge Marovich was on senior status and was absent from the district for an extended period. After some false starts due to the government's inability to locate the original petition, the defendant filed the necessary documents and the government responded. Defendant was to file any reply by August 10, 2000, but no reply has been filed.

The thrust of the petition is that the earlier felony conviction has seriously hampered defendant's efforts to earn a living. She asks that her conviction offense be changed from a

435

felony to a misdemeanor, just as her brother-in-law, George Robinson, was permitted to plead to misdemeanor counts after the jury was unable to reach a verdict with respect to the charges against him.

Barber, 881 F.2d 345, 348 (7th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 495 U.S. 922 (1990). The first is that there must be a defect that saps the proceedings of any validity, United States v. Keane, 852 F.2d 199, 202-03 (7th Cir. 1988), cert. denied, 490 U.S. 1084 (1989), an error of the most fundamental character, United States v. Bush, 888 F.2d 1145, 1147-48 (7th Cir. 1989). But here no error is even claimed. Defendant was indicted, she went to trial, she entered a plea while the jury was deliberating, the factual basis for the plea is well-documented in the plea agreement, and she was sentenced (as was George Robinson) to a period of probation which has long expired. While we recognize that the conviction may well have a lingering effect on various aspects of her life, we have no authority in those circumstances to issue the writ requested or to alter the historical record. The petition is denied.

<u>aug. 31</u>, 2000.

JAMES B. MORAN
Senior Judge, U. S. District Court